identifying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office (AAO)
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090

U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

[redacted]

B5

Date: MAY 29 2012 Office: NEBRASKA SERVICE CENTER [redacted]

IN RE: Petitioner: [redacted]
Beneficiary:

PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:

SELF REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the AAO inappropriately applied the law in reaching its decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen with the field office or service center that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of $630. The specific requirements for filing such a motion can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. **Do not file any motion directly with the AAO.** Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires any motion to be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Perry Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The employment-based immigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Nebraska Service Center, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is an electronics company. It seeks to employ the beneficiary permanently in the United States as an industrial engineering manager pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2). As required by statute, a labor certification accompanied the petition. The director determined that the petitioner had not established that it had the continuing ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition. The director denied the petition accordingly.

In a request for evidence (RFE) dated February 23, 2012, the AAO requested evidence to establish that the petitioner has the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage beginning on the priority date of the visa petition and continuing up to the present.[1] Specifically, the petitioner was instructed to submit the company's federal tax returns and/or audited financial statements for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 and any Forms W-2 or 1099 issued to the beneficiary by the petitioner for 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. The petitioner was also asked to submit evidence of the sole proprietor's household expenses from 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011, including mortgage payments, rent, automobile loans, insurance, household utilities, real estate taxes, tuition, and credit card obligations.

This office allowed the petitioner 60 days in which to respond to the RFE. In the RFE, the AAO specifically alerted the petitioner that failure to respond to the RFE could result in dismissal of the appeal. The failure to submit requested evidence that precludes a material line of inquiry shall be grounds for denying the petition. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(14). More than 60 days have passed and the petitioner has failed to respond with proof that it has the ability to pay the beneficiary the proffered wage.[2]

Thus, the appeal will be dismissed as abandoned.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.

---

[1] The AAO conducts appellate review on a *de novo* basis. The AAO's *de novo* authority is well recognized by the federal courts. *See Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

[2] On March 19, 2012, the AAO received a letter from petitioner's prior counsel, [redacted] stating that they no longer represented the petitioner.